



A rubric for Summative Peer Review of Teaching

GUIDANCE NOTES

The rubric was developed in March – June 2018 by an *ad hoc* working group comprising faculty members, Faculty leadership and members of the Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology ([see a full list](#)). It was further developed through a number of consultations with input from representatives, including UBC Health, and others, in 2019. To facilitate sharing and development, this work is licensed through a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).



Why did we develop the Rubric for the Summative Peer Review of Teaching?

Summative Peer Review of Teaching (SPRT) is an important and required component of re-appointment, promotion and tenure processes, and a vital counterweight to information from Student Evaluations of Teaching (SEoT). Discussions between representatives with responsibility for overseeing processes in individual Faculties, and members of the Senior Appointments Committee (SAC) suggested there was an opportunity to develop a more consistent approach to reporting on peer evaluations of teaching, while still preserving the individualized approaches Faculties have taken to implement SPRT processes.

What were our goals?

- To complement (and enhance) existing Faculty, School and Department processes for SPRT, rather than create additional work for them.
- To develop a more standardized approach to reporting SPRT.
- To develop a shared and more nuanced understanding of levels of attainment for SPRT and dimensions of teaching activity that are part of evaluation of teaching by peers.
- To support the consideration of an “individual’s entire teaching contribution”¹ across a range of teaching contexts, in evaluating their teaching.
- To develop resources that would also provide support for formative (developmental) evaluations of teaching.

Who do we expect might use the rubric and why?

We anticipate that this rubric will be of use to a range of stakeholders:

- Faculty members, as reviewers or reviewees, will develop a clearer understanding of minimum expectations for teaching for different roles and ranks, together with examples of activities at various levels of attainment.
- SPRT committees/Heads of Department will be able to make use of a consistent, yet flexible, framework to effectively evaluate teaching and build a case for support to Faculty-level committees and SAC.
- Deans (and their Advisory Committees on Promotion and Tenure) and SAC members will receive consistent and more differentiated SPRTs, allowing them to be more effectively weighted against student evaluations.



How to use this document

We anticipate that there are a number of ways in which this rubric may be used:

- As a support for individual reflection on, and inspiration for improvement in, one's own teaching.
- As a complement to existing PRT guidelines, processes and forms.
- To accompany PRT processes that include classroom observations, reviewing teaching materials or a teaching dossier, and meeting with the reviewee.
- To provide clear language and examples of levels of attainment for different ranks, as a component of overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness (e.g. the Head's letter in a dossier).
- As a basis for departments and programs to create their own disciplinary and context-specific examples, language and terminology (in keeping with this intention, the rubric and associated documentation are Creative Commons licensed for continuing development and improvement).
- The rubric may also be helpful for individuals who have been asked to write a letter of support for a teaching award, reference letter, or who are required to comment on a candidate's teaching accomplishments.

Be aware that candidates are not expected to be able to "check-off" all the examples listed in order to achieve a particular level. It is also understood that not all instructors will have the same opportunities or expectations to engage in all areas. For example, there may be limited opportunities to be involved in course or program-level curriculum design within their department.

Language and terminology — levels of attainment

The rubric defines seven levels of attainment in teaching: the lowest two of these fall below the minimum expectations for promotion and tenure as described in the UBC Collective Agreement. The remainder are defined using language taken from the relevant sections of the Collective Agreement, and thus specify the minimum levels of attainment for various ranks, i.e.

- Assistant Professor (3.06) — potential for successful teaching
- Associate Professor (3.07) — evidence of successful teaching beyond that of an Assistant Professor
- Full Professor (3.08) — high quality in teaching
- Instructor (3.02) — evidence of ability and commitment to teaching
- Senior Instructor (3.03) — evidence of excellence in teaching
- Professor of Teaching (3.04) — outstanding achievement in teaching

Language and terminology — dimensions of teaching

Dimensions of teaching incorporate the activities that contribute to fulfilling the institution's teaching and learning mandate. They encompass the design of course-level and program-level curricula, the various activities of instruction through different engagement with students (classroom, seminar, laboratory, small group work, experiential learning, consultations, community placements, etc.) and modalities (e.g., web-enhanced, blended and online). The dimension of educator development (i.e. growth and improvement in one's own practice) is not formally part of a SPRT, but is an important contributing element to the overall evaluation and holistic assessment of a reviewee's teaching over a period of time, complementing the "single-point-in-time" assessments normally associated with evaluation of learning design and teaching activity elements.



The examples listed at each level in the accompanying documents are intended to help the reviewers and candidates gain a sense of the various levels of attainment. They are representative, not authoritative. For each level above “Successful,” the rubric is cumulative, i.e. it is assumed that the educator has already successfully met the requirements of the previous level. It is also assumed that the educator has built upon their skills from the previous level and can demonstrate their growth.

Limitations and exclusions

The rubric focuses on elements of teaching evaluation (other than SEoT) that would form part of a Head’s letter in a candidate’s file. The rubric, however, excludes the following:

- Educational leadership (EL) — The rubric excludes EL, which is defined as “impact beyond one’s own classroom,” such as impact on peers, the department, the institution, or the discipline. In practice, the distinction between teaching practice and educational leadership may be blurred².
- Educational Service — The rubric also excludes service activities undertaken to facilitate the enablement of teaching and learning.
- Student Supervision — The rubric includes this only to a limited extent. The direction and supervision of individual students’ work (undergraduate and/or graduate) is regarded as a component of teaching in the Collective Agreement, and is represented in the rubric through the faculty member’s contribution to the overall intellectual growth of their students.³

Future developments and revisions

This draft rubric will be further refined through pilot adoption. If you have questions or comments, please contact Dr. Simon Bates, Associate-Provost Teaching and Learning, at simon.bates@ubc.ca, or Dr. Christina Hendricks, Academic Director, Centre for Teaching, Learning and Technology, at christina.hendricks@ubc.ca.

[Download the Summative Peer Review of Teaching Rubric \(PDF\)](#)

¹ Article 4.02, Collective Agreement between UBC and the Faculty Association of The University of British Columbia

² Resources to support the articulation of EL activities and impact, and how it differs from service contributions in the arena of teaching and learning can be found online. <https://ctlit.ubc.ca/programs/all-our-programs/teaching-and-educational-leadership/>

³ For further information, please refer to the UBC Guide to the Principles of Excellent Graduate Supervision. <https://www.grad.ubc.ca/faculty-staff/information-supervisors/principles-graduate-supervision>